



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# XI. — *Some Obscurities in the Assibilation of ti and di before a Vowel in Vulgar Latin*

BY PROFESSOR ALBERT J. CARNOY

UNIVERSITIES OF LOUVAIN AND PENNSYLVANIA

THE resolution of *i* before a vowel into a palatal consonant appears early in Vulgar Latin, and the various assimilations, palatalizations, and assibilations to which the groups *ky*, *ty*, *dy*, etc. were subjected, have greatly contributed to the transformation of Latin into Romance phonology. These phenomena are well known in their general lines. In the details, however, various obscurities still need an elucidation and, notably, the chronology of the various changes is not yet definitely established.

The case of *ty* is the clearest. Its assibilation is the most ancient of all. The testimonies of grammarians bearing on the point are enumerated in Seelmann's *Aussprache des Lateins*, in my *Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions* and in Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (p. 117). The most important are those of Servius, in *Don*. (Seelman, p. 320): Iotacismi sunt quotiens post *ti* vel *di* syllabam sequuntur vocales, et plerumque supra dictae syllabae in sibilum transeunt; and of Papirius quoted by Cassiodorus (*ib.*): *Iustitia* cum scribitur, tertia syllaba sic sonat quasi constet ex tribus litteris: *t*, *z*, *i*. Pompeius is more emphatic yet: Si dicas *Titius*, pinguis sonat et perdit sonum suum et accipit sibilum.

Ancient as those statements are, they are appreciably later than epigraphic forms such as CRESCENTSIAN [US] (140 A.D., Seelman, 323), and MARSIANESSES = Martianenses (3d cent., *C.I.L.* xv, 2612), not to mention many other forms which have no date, but undoubtedly are older than the fourth century A.D.

The interest offered by the testimony of the grammarians lies rather in their manner of presenting the facts. Thus, they do not condemn *tsy* as an inelegant vulgarism; they

accept the pronunciation as wholly admissible; they even speak as though *tsy* were to be preferred to all other pronunciations, including of course the pronunciation *ty* which they obviously consider as pedantic and clumsy. This shows that the assibilation was old enough to have invaded all classes of society, but it implies also that so late as that time there were some "lettrés" who affected to say *tio* or *tyo* instead of *tsy*.

As to *ky* for *ci* + vowel, the history is very different. JUDIGSIUM, *Insc. Hisp. Christ.* 108 (6th cent., *Lat. Esp.* pp. 144, 148), which I found in Spain, is perhaps the oldest form that can be quoted as a direct proof of the phenomenon. *Μαρσιανός*, mentioned by Eckinger (*Orthog. lat. Wörter in griech. Insch.* p. 103) and dating back to 225 A.D., is doubtful, since a contamination between *Martius* and *Marcius* is the most natural explanation of the form. In Southern Italy, in Sardinia and in Rumania, the anterior palatal developed from *ci* was attracted by *tsy* from *ti* and both sibilants are now alike. In Central Italy and in Gaul, on the contrary, *ky* shared in the fate of the palatal developed from *c* + *e* or *i*. All this points to a later assibilation for *ky* than for *ty*.

The difference of treatment between *ty* and *ky* makes it improbable that prior to their assibilation they ever were so near to one another that they could be easily confused in the pronunciation. I thus refuse to follow Grandgent (*op. cit.* p. 116) when he points to such a similarity in order to account for the frequent interchanges between *ti* and *ci* from the second century until the seventh. He gives a great many instances of that interchange, of which the older are: *Ἀρουντιανός* = Aruntianus (131 A.D.), *terminaciones* (2d cent.), *concupiscencia* (an acrostic in Commodian), *justicia* (in an edict of Diocletian), *definiciones* (222-235 A.D.), *ocio* (389 A.D.), etc. I collected a few others in *Lat. Esp.* pp. 151, 154 (*Brucius*, *Viriarius*, *Terciae*, *Cancio*, etc.).

If, however, we stop to consider those forms more closely, we are struck by two facts: (1) *ci* for *ti* is infinitely more frequent than the reverse; (2) *ti* for *ci* is only found where a confusion of suffixes or words explains the change; *menda-*

*tium* (Bonnet, *Latin de Greg. de Tours*, p. 171), *solatium*, *Portius*, *Albutius* (*Lat. Esp.* p. 142) — instances, moreover, more or less doubtful or pretty late. These facts are not reconcilable with the hypothesis of a confusion — absolute or relative — between *ty* and *ky*. The natural development of the palatal was bringing *ky* always nearer to *ty*, and it would have been natural, therefore, to find *ti* written for *ci* rather than the reverse.

I propose thus to consider *ci* as a reaction against *tsy*. As the aforementioned statements of the grammarians seemed to imply, there were people who affected to say *ty*, while *tsy* had become the current pronunciation. It was unavoidable that for those whose articulation was *tsy*, the *ty* heard in the language of the "lettrés" should be mistaken for the *ky* of *socius*, *facies*, etc. In that manner the conviction was created that *ky* was the refined pronunciation of the sound articulated *tsy* in the vernacular. Accordingly the "demi-lettrés" were apt to pronounce actually : *terminaciones*, *concupiscencia*, *Arun-cius*, etc. with a regular *ky*. It is not surprising, therefore, that *ci* was often found in the spelling. We have in this phenomenon a perfect parallel to the treatment of *au*, one or two centuries before. As is well known, in Central Italy, *ō* had replaced *au* in the language of the people, but the officials, grammarians, etc. were gradually reintroducing *au*, which had remained the standard pronunciation. In many cases this *au*, in contrast with the popular *ō*, was mistaken by the people for a long *a*, so that besides *Glōcus*, *Scōrus*, *Ōlus*, *Ōrelianus*, etc., there developed a pronunciation *Glācus*, *Scārus*, *Ālus*, *Ārelianus* as a would-be imitation of *Glaucus*, *Scaurus*, *Aulus*, *Aurelianus*, (cf. the epigraphic forms mentioned in *Lat. Esp.* pp. 86-95). Like *ā* for *au*, *ci* for *ti* is found largely in proper names, more subjected to the influence of fashion. That the change was not merely orthographic is shown, for example, by place-names such as *Graçay* (Cher) from *Graciacum* for *Gratiacum*, *Gresy* (Savoie) from *Gratiacum*, *Saciacum* for *Satiacum* in *Sayssac* (Taru), *Sacy* (Oise), *Varacius* for *Varatius* in *Varacieu* (Isère), etc. (Gröhler, *Franz. Ortsnamen*, 255, 285, 299).

Outside the proper names, when the articulation *ky* prevailed over *ty* and was transmitted to the Romance languages instead of the Latin *ti*, it was generally on account of a contamination of suffixes. The French *-esse* for *-itia* (*pigritia*, O.Fr. *perece*, Fr. *paresse*) about which Nyrop says that neither the origin nor the reason is known (*Gram. hist. de la langue fr.* III, p. 111), has apparently, during the period of uncertainty that we have been alluding to, undergone a crossing in Gaul with *-icia*; hence a suffix *-icia*, used both for the abstracts in *-itia* and for collectives in local denominations like *Cornesse*, *Bovesse*, *Vresse* in Belgium and France (= *cornicia*, *bovicia*, *verricia* [*sc. villa*] — though one more often finds the lengthened form *-aricia* [*Porcheresse*, *Favresse*, *Vacheresse*; see Nyrop, *op. cit.* III, p. 109]).

The other sporadic cases of *ci* for *ti* are to be explained by the late formation of the group. If, for instance, *\*exquartiare*, *\*guttiare* are rendered by It. *squarciare*, *gocciare*, it is because when these verbs were formed by way of the Vulgar Latin suffix *-iare*, *ty* had already been assibilated. The new *ty* was thus very naturally attracted by *ky*. This also applies to *ty* in the group *sty*. The *s*, probably by dissimilation, prevented the assibilation of *ty*, and it is not surprising that this isolated *ty* also was attracted by *ky*, as is shown by It. *angoscia*, *bescio*, *uscio* from *angustia*, *\*bestius*, *astium*. This, no doubt, also applies to a few cases of *ty* preserved after a consonant before the accent (Meyer-Luebke, *Gram. lang. rom.* I, p. 458) as *\*captiare* > It. *cacciare*, Fr. *chasser*; *linteolum* > Fr. *linceul*; and perhaps *\*cum-initiare* > It. *cominciare*.

The other problem connected with assibilation to be solved in this article concerns *dy*.

As is well known, both the Romance languages and a great many forms in the inscriptions and the manuscripts abundantly prove that about the third century A.D., *j*, *g + e* or *i*, *gy*, and *dy* were articulated as a plain *y* (consonantal *i*). The Romance languages moreover show that in Vulgar Latin *z* joined the same series, apparently through the medium of *dy*,

and soon was reduced into *y*. This is shown by spellings such as *baptidiare*, *gargaridiare* (*Lat. Esp.* p. 156), *Iosimus* = *Zosimus* (*C.I.L.* iv, 4599), so that there is no doubt whatever that the *y* of O.Fr. *batoyer* (*baptizare*), Sp. *jujuba* (*zyzyphum*), Fr. *jaloux* (*zelosus*), etc., dates back to Vulgar Latin.

On the other hand, in my study on *Le Latin d'Espagne*, p. 156, I drew attention to the surprising frequency of *z* written for *dy* or *y* in later times, and I alluded to the possibility that besides the pronunciation *y* a school pronunciation *dz* might have existed for *z* and even for *y*, *dy*, etc. Grandgent has been led to the same opinion by the consideration of various texts of grammarians and of some Italian forms, e.g. *mezzo* (*medius*), *mozzo* (*modius*), *razzo* (*radius*), *rozzo* (*\*rudius*), *olezzo* (*\*olidius*), etc. The texts of the grammarians bearing on the subject are :

Servius, in *Don.* (quoted on p. 145, *supra*) ; Id. in *Georg.* II, 216 (Seelman, *op. cit.* 320) : *Media; di sine sibilo proferenda est, graecum enim nomen est* ; Isid. (Seelman, *op. cit.* 321) : *Solent Itali dicere ozie pro hodie.*

The change of *y* into *dz* is very unlikely. It is thus certain that *dz**y* could only develop in case the *d* was preserved in the group *dy*. It was thus reasonable to think, as Grandgent and myself did, that *dz* could not have started from the people's language, because there *dy* had lost *d* at an early period. The pronunciation *dz**y* for *dy* implies thus that the "lettrés" had preserved the *d* of *dy* much longer than the people.

In that theory, however, one overlooks the fact that there are two serious objections against the assumption that *dz**y* was a learned pronunciation. First, one does not clearly see why the "lettrés" who had opposed *y* for *dy* when almost everybody used it, should themselves have introduced later, in spite of the spelling and the tradition, a pronunciation *dz**y* that was not heard in the vernacular. Next, it is not plain why in the case of words so common as *medius*, *hodie*, *radius*, etc., the people should have abandoned their own forms, *meyus*, *oye*, *rayus*, etc., to adopt the very remote learned equivalents, *medzyus*, *odzye*, *radzius*, etc. Moreover,

no explanation is given for the statement of Isidore that *ozie* for *hodie* is specifically Italian. The testimony of Isidore is important here, however, since it is curiously consistent with the fact that it is only in Italy that *dz* for *dy* is found after a vowel (*mozzo*, *mezzo*, *rasso*, etc.)

To account for these various difficulties, I propose the following explanation :

The use of *dz* or *dz* for *dy* was a popular evolution, entirely parallel to *tsy* for *ty* and probably contemporaneous. Only it would have come when *dy* had already generally been reduced into *y* and, therefore, it could only have applied to exceptional cases in which *dy*, for some reason, had preserved its *d*. Now, we know from the Romance languages that such was the case for *di* + vowel after *r* and often for *di* + vowel after *n*. In some dialects even, for instance in Provençal, *di* is still preserved nowadays after *r* (Prov. *ordi* = *hordeum*). It is precisely in that case that *dz* for *dy* is found in most Romance languages, as illustrated, for example, by *hordeum* > It. *orzo*, Rum. *orz*, Sard. *ordzu*; *prandium* > It. *pranzo*, Rum. *prînz*, Sard. *pranzu*; *verecundia* > Sp. *verguenza* (besides *vergueña*).

It is evident that in these words *dz* for *dy* is due to a popular evolution. Now, beyond this case, one finds *dz* in Italian for a few *dy*'s of late origin, which are obviously posterior to the simplification of *dy* into *y*. In these cases *dy* very naturally was treated as *dy* in *prandium*. So *\*rudius* "raw" > It. *rozzo*, *\*olidius* "fragrant" > It. *olezzo* (Meyer-Luebbe, *op. cit.* 1, p. 460). These are formations with the suffix *-ius*, typical of late Vulgar Latin. Consequently for *mezzo*, *rasso*, *mozzo*, the most natural explanation would be the late preservation of *d* in the *dy* of these words in the pronunciation of the people of Italy. Unfortunately It. *raggio*, *oggi*, etc., and many other words in which *dy* is treated like *j* in *majus* > It. *maggio*, show that the phenomenon cannot have had the regularity of a normal phonetic law.

Now, there is another process in Italian Latin that shows the same irregularity: it is the doubling of consonants after the accented vowels. One finds it appearing capriciously in

many words mostly familiar, in competition with forms which retain the single consonant: *cĭppus*, *cĭpus*; *cŭppa*, *cŭpa*; *băcca*, *băca*; *căppo*, *căpo*; etc. If the consonant was followed by an *i* or a *u* before a vowel, the chances of doubling were rather increased, as is shown by It. *bascio* (\**bassium*), *cascio* (\**casseus*), *tenne* (\**tenuit*), *volle* (*voluit*), *sappia* (*sapiat*), etc., and by Latin forms like *acqua* in the *Appendix Probi* (Grandgent, *op. cit.* p. 70; Stolz, *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Sprache*, I, p. 223). Why then should we not admit the possibility that besides *medius*, *modius*, *radius*, *hodie*, etc., there existed the doublets *meddius*, *moddius*, etc.? Like *dy* after consonants, *ddy* resisted the tendency to reduce *dy* into *y*, and they were thus assibilated together.

In this manner, moreover, one accounts for the introduction of *dzy* for all sorts of *dy*'s in the school language. The "lettrés" had resisted the reduction of *dy* into *y* and preserved *dy*, but when they capitulated before *tsy* for *ty*, they also adopted *dzy* for *dy*, which they heard in the popular pronunciation in *prandziu*, *hodzie*, etc.; but in contrast with the people they were pronouncing *dz* for all the *dy*'s, so that there developed among the Romans the feeling that *dz* was the elegant equivalent of popular *y*. It was thus to be expected as a further development that the equation, "popular *y* = elegant *dz*" would be sporadically extended to all kinds of *y*, even those coming from *gy*, *g* + *e* or *i*, etc.; hence forms such as *septuazinta* (Lat. *Esp.*, p. 156); *zouliae*; *zanuari* (Schuchardt, *Vokalismus d. Vulgär-lateins*, I, 69). It was no less to be expected that *z* would be found mostly in the spelling of words which belonged more or less to the school language. In fact in the lists of Schuchardt (*op. cit.* I, 67 and III, 23) nearly all the instances belong to that category: *Aziabenico*, *Azabenico* for *Adiablenico*, *Elviza* for *Helvidia*, *zabulius*, *zabullus*, *zabulio* for *diabolo*, *Zodorus* for *Diodorus*, *Zonysius* for *Dionysius*, *Zogenes* for *Diogenes*, etc. Reverse spellings are: *Ariobardianes* for *Ariobarzanes*, *gaiam*, *gaiopilacio* for *gazam*, *gazophylax*, *ieses* = *ἱεσς*, *topagius* = *topazius*.

The profusion of *z*'s in the foreign words is a valuable confirmation of our theory. Those borrowed words, those



foreign names, obviously penetrated into Latin when *dy* had already been reduced to *y* in the vernacular. Those late *dy*'s were thus quite regularly assimilated into *dz*. Moreover, most of those nouns came through the medium of Greek. Now, the semi-educated knew that Greek words were full of *z*'s that were pronounced *y* by the people, while those who knew better articulated *dz* for these *z*'s. People who were more prudent than learned were thus inclined to write a *z* wherever there was a *y* in the pronunciation of those words. This resulted in such forms as *Zerax* (Schuchardt, *op. cit.*, I, 169), *Zo(b)*, *Zaco(b)* (*Lat. Esp.*, p. 158), for *Hierax*, *Job*, *Jacob*.

In conclusion, it may be said that this article, while it aims at bringing order into the various apparent abnormalities in the treatment of *ty* and *dy*, emphasizes the necessity of considering the phonetic changes in their mutual relations rather than as isolated processes. The doubling of consonants after accented vowels in Italy was a well-known tendency, but it does not seem to have occurred to anybody that it was likely to interfere with the reduction of *dy*. On the other hand, it was not sufficiently understood that the articulatory habits which produced *tsy* for *ty* almost necessarily introduced *dzy* for *dy*. The part played by attraction in phonetic evolution is illustrated by the absorption of late *ty* into *ky*, and of *ky* itself now by *tsy*, now by *k* (*c + e* or *i*). In all this I have been applying the principles laid down, notably, by Meillet in *Indogerm. Forsch.* x, p. 65, ff. Finally, it may be said that although school Latin is known to be a disturbing conservative force in the development of Folk-Latin, its importance has been rather underestimated. This paper shows that it not only preserved some articulations but that it has introduced various compromises and confusions, so that even in phonetics it may also be regarded as a creative force. In this may be seen an extension to phonetics of the influence of special languages to which I invited attention in a previous paper.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *T.A.P.A.* XLVI (1915), 75-85.